P. F. 70-92.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.
L.R. 37-81
L.R. 135-91

1895-96

192 .

(L - R.)

File No. 147-95

Serial Nos. 1-4

Later references.

P. 40

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 — 4

Part B for Year 96

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Lingappa, Claiming the Patel Office of Nyamanahalli Village in the Honnali Taluk —

Refer to

V

Ref. 147-93-21

1895

No. 1197

Name of Petitioner, Patil Lingappa

Village, Nyamti

Taluk, Hirekeri

District, Dharwar

Date of Appl, 2-9-95

Date of Receipt, 6-9-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 1-

Appeals against the

ABSTRACT.

Dharwar District Collector's order
to the Amildar, Hirekeri dated
"I have personally seen Sarvani-
-kaya charge. He is appointed
as Patil Samadhi on probation
for six months, after which a
report should be made about his
conduct. From your report
no 1083 of 25-3-95, it is seen that
Patil Lingappa is not attending
to Collection duties. Two Patels
cannot be appointed in the
same village on collection
duty without guarantee.
Such a practice
is found fruitless in the future
Accordingly to Govt Order
1255 of 3.1.94 if there are two
1055
in a village one should be

Put up this Petition & the Order
and Petitr's produced with the
Petn
The Petn relating to the Patel of Nyamti is
pending

23/9

Stamp sufficient

Petr's time to appeal to 16 days
(Copy of Collr's order applied for
on 21/9/95 & dated 6 days, were
deducted as a date in the said
Petition - From supplying it was
the last date to file appeal & the
act of time as noted)

Petr's prayer that the arrangement
made in the Off. Dr. Comr
is opposed to the express order of his
predecessor that the pancha should
be the revenue work & an inquiry
might personally be proper & that the
person in whose behalf he is appl. does
not reside in the village, and that a
man connected & proper should be
doing the duties.

Subs for order

Order and
Connected
30-9-95

Memorandum to
only in reference
to Mr. Nadgir known
to him - and the
Petition one dealt
with. Mr. Nadgir
before and
Dy Comr enquired
& if necessary the
report need
not be called
for
28/11/96

Revenue duties entirely in the hands of the Appella

(7) That Swamirayachar the new Gumasta is not a native of the above village; that he is yet only 16 or 17 years old and that Seenapp who has suffered imprisonment is managing all duties. Bhagamma two s not residing at Namta since the last 5 years.

(8) That the enclosed records clearly show that the Revd. duties were managed by the appellant's ancestors; that after the death of Venkatapathiappa the respondent's father-in-law the appellant was the sole huckdar that two Patels are unnecessary for the villa that Mr. Gundappa the Amildar of Honnale had reported that the Petr. alone should be Revenue Patel; that against all these grounds the Dy Comr. has simply followed the report of the then Amildar and removed the Revd. duties from the appellant.

He prays that the records may be gone through and the Dy Comr's order reversed -

KBR. 1/7/9-

to Revenue work and the other to Police work. From the records it is seen that the Brahmin aforesaid Patel of Revenue & the Police Patil was managed by the Lingayat Patel. The Brahmin Patil Gumasta will accordingly be posted to Rev. work, the Lingayat Patil Lingappa looking after Police duties."

Respondent's order.

Respondent stated that the Dy. Supt. order appointing the Lingayat as joint Patil to the above village and the appointment of Somappa (the) as her Gumasta is against Patil rules.

(2) That the appellant was joint Patil till 8/ and thereafter he was independent Patil looking after both Rev. & Police duties; that the Mamlatdar, subsequently reported that collection work was not well conducted; that the Dy. Supt. acted on this report and that there are no grounds for saying that collection work was not well conducted;

(3) That since 8/ when the appellant was appointed as Revenue Patil the revenue of the Nyamti village has increased by Rs. 500 and that by his exertions the arrears did not exceed Rs. 300 any year.

(4) That the claim of the Patil of the above village belongs to the appellant's family; that the respondent's father-in-law was the joint post in the middle of the period; that such a fact is clear from the records; that Patil's duties are inclusive of Rev. work; that it is quite unjust that the Patil's duties should be managed by a stranger Gumasta who does not belong to the Patil family; and that there are no grounds for taking away the Patilki from the appellant, to whose family it belongs.

(5) That the income of the Nyamti village is only Rs. 1,500; that Gumasta Abdul Rahiman previously ordered that one Patil was sufficient for this village; and that the policy of post is to appoint only one Patil to a village.

(6) That there are no competent persons in the respondent's family to look after the duties of Patil; that the respondent's father-in-law Gumasta Sheikha was once impeached and consequently rejected by the Gumasta Abdul Rahiman Sahib, thus leaving the Revenue

3. [illegible] 1891 [illegible]

4. [illegible]

COURT FEE

TWO RUPEES

4 (36)

DIWAN'S OFFICE
DEPARTMENT
REGD. NO.
DATE

1191

(Ten enclosures)
R.P. (St-2 Rly)
Petitioner

6

5. [illegible]

6. [illegible]

7. [illegible] 15-16

(d)

(e)

(f)

(g)

(d)

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

1896

Pet 6714
571

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Shimoga District

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore.
Genl and Revenue Departts

Dated

Despatched 3d March 1896.

Received

Enclosures—No. North 10 encs.

General No. 951
No. 694

With reference to his Offl
Memo No P.7 dated 31st
70-92
January last reports
upon the petition of Patel
Linigappa of Nyamty,
Honnali Taluk.

Pet
6-3-96
Petition Branch
87
6/3/96
Submitted.
7/3

Subd with reference
the two Councillors
on petn No: 1197.

7-3-96

Agreement
Civil interference
Memo of Commis
when Minutes
approved must
be worked out 10/3/96

11-3-96.

Noted
11/3

Approved
Rao
21/3/96

Pet
7-70-92 Rev II

5-2-96

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

L R 47-95

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition
Registered No. 197 dated 12-9-95
received at the Dewan's Office from
Patel Lingappa of Nyamti
Honnali Taluk Complaining
of the appointment of Shama
rayachar as Revenue Patel
Gumasta of Nyamti

is forwarded, together with its ten
enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner
of the Shimoga District
for disposal, and if necessary
for report.

By order,

Draft

31/1/96

For Revenue ~~Chief~~ Secretary.

BANGALORE,
27 January 1896

52

31/1

M.G.C.P.E.—25-1-95—500

No 351
634
Encl: Engd with 10 enclosures

12

Ahuriri District
Deputy Registrar's Office
Ahuriri 3rd March 1892.

To

The Secretary to Government
General and Revenue Departts

Sir,

With reference to your official Memo No 37/92 dated 3rd ultimo forwarding for disposal and if necessary for report a Petition with enclosures from Pakeha Rigatika of Waiau, Kaikoura, praying to be appointed to report as follows:—

2. Petitioner says that he has been ordered to conduct the duties of the Police. Pakeha of Waiau, and that as he is the Pakeha Ruehikar he may be ordered to do the duties of the Revenue Pakeha which is now being performed by another Pakeha, who is a Brahmin.

3. Prior to 1892, there were two Patels for this village as shown the Petitioner was the Police Patel and Virabasappa (a Brahmin) the Revenue Patel.

4. In 1892 Virabasappa having died, the former Deputy Commissioner Mr. Abdul Rahiman, Khan Bahadur, ordered that only one Patel (Petitioner Lingappa) should conduct the duties of both the Revenue and Police Patels, and that if he cannot manage the work, he may keep a Gumasta in addition. × Ex. 13 g. & 2. 5-92

5. If on the Lingappa, brother of the deceased Patel Virabasappa appealed to Government who in their decision dated 2nd November 1893 in the unreported noted cases × directed that if 2 Patels are needed it would not be right to turn out the appellant Lingappa and give × Petition Ex. 55 & 57. 89-92 &c - Ex. 92 g. 892-92

the appointment to a relation of the Respondent Sugatha (Present Petitioner) or allow him to display a Garland. That the policy of Government has been to have only a Patel for each village, and if in pursuance of that policy the Deputy Commissioner thinks that one Patel is enough, he may continue Respondent (Present Petitioner) alone in sole charge of the office, but if 2 are required he should appoint the appellant (Ramappa) instead of one of the sons of the Respondent.

6. On receipt of the above decision necessary enquiry was instituted and it having been found necessary to have two Patels for the important village of Hyanty, Govt. Pleader Rao, the then Deputy Commissioner

directed that Rugakha should conduct the duties of the Police Patel as before, and that the Kulkarni Patel should conduct the duties of the Revenue Patel.

7. I see no reason to alter the existing arrangement. The present petitioner Rugakha committed certain irregularities in a recent murder case at Tyanty by not rendering proper information of the facts immediately after the occurrence and aiding the Police in investigating the case and he has therefore been placed under suspension.

8. The petition with its enclosures received with the above are herewith resubmitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Raghunath Dey
Asst. Deputy Commissioner
Sirsinga Circle

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಪಿಎಂಎಸ್ ಬಿಎಲ್ಆರ್

ದಿನಾಂಕ - ಅಧೀನ ಮಾಲೀಕರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ

ವಿಷಯ ಪತ್ರ ಬಿ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು 21-3-96

By order

Draft

Asst Secretary

Ref
PMS 9:pp:96 924-3-96
26.

Copy of the above endorsement is forwarded to the Dy: Commr Shimoga Dist with reference to his letter No. 65 694 dated the 3rd instant.

By order

Draft

Asst Secretary

Rao/